ENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

REC'D	2.7	JAN 2005
WIPO		PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

(Rationalised Report according to the Notice of the President of the EPO published in the OJ11/2001)

Applicant's or agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Notificati Preliminary E	on of Transmittal of In Examination Report (Fo	ternational orm PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No.	International filing date (day	y month year)	Priority date (day mo	onth/year)	
PCT/IT03/00729	11/11/2003		14/11/2002		
International Patent Classification (IPC) o					
International Lacric Commission (12 9)				-	
	A62D5/00				
Applicant					
CL. COM ADVANCED TECHNOLO	UGY et al.		<u> </u>		
This international preliminary ex Authority and is transmitted to the second	he applicant according to Artic	ie 30.	•	amining	
2. This REPORT consists of a to	tal of sheets, include	ling this cover she	et.		
This report is also accompanded and are the (see Rule 70.16 and Section	This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).				
These annexes consists of a total	of sheets.				
3. This report contains indications	relating to the following items:			,	
I X Basis of the report				1	
II Priority					
III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability					
			•		
IV Lack of unity of inve	ention			·	
V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement					
VI Certain documents of	rited				
	e international application			İ	
	s on the international application	nn.			
VIII Certain observation	s on the international applicant	,11			
•					
	•				
			-		
			•		
Date of submission of the demand		Date of completion	n of this report		
Sac 6. 500		26.01-0	عمدا		
03/06/2004		80.01-	, (()	works Patentam.	
Name and mailing address of the IPEA	1	Authorized officer		O Tuene . E.	
European Patent Office					
D-80298 Munich Tel. (+49-89) 2399-0, Tx:	523656 epmu d	Bernard	Louis Petit		
Fax: (+49-89) 2399-4465					
Form PCT/IPEA/409 (cover sheet) P204	476 (October 2002) (23/13	2/2004)	Λ	· Office Burops	

PCT/IT03/00729

I.	Basis	of the	report
----	-------	--------	--------

1.	This re	port ha	as been drawn up on the basis (of (Replacement shee	s which have been furnished to the receiving Office in respon	
	invitatio amend	on una	ier Articie 14 are referred to in t	his report as °originally	filed" and are not annexed to the report since they do not co	nse to a ntain
			the international application a	es originally filed		
		X	the description, pages	1 - 18	, as originally filed	
			pages		, filed with the demand	
			pages	•	, filed with the letter of	
	•					
		X	the claims, Nos.		, as originally filed	
			Nos.	• -	, as amended under Article 19	•
			Nos.		, filed with the demand	٠
			Nos.	1 - 11	, filed with the letter of 8.	11.04
		X	the drawings, sheets / fig.	1/2, 2/2	, as originally filed	
			sheets / fig.		, filed with the demand	
			sheets / fig.		, filed with the letter of	
						•
2.	The am	endme	ents have resulted in the cance	llation of:	·	
	•		the description, pages:			
			the claims, Nos.	••	•	
			the drawings, sheets / fig.			-
3.	X	This beyon	report has been established as nd the disclosure as filed, as ind	if (some of) the amend dicated below (Rule 70	iments had not been made, since they have been considered .2 (c)).	to go

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

The documents as filed do not provide any basis for using the expression "gown" in the claims. the only disclosure refers to "overall" as indicated for instance in original claim 3.

Consequently examination will be carried out as if the expression "overall" had been used instead of the term "gown", ie, as if claims1 and 3 filed with letter dated 6.9.04 had been combined.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

PCT/IT03/00729

Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citation and explanations supporting such statement

1.	Statement

Novelty .	Claims	•	YES
•	Claims	1 - 11	NO
Inventive Step	Claims		YES
•	Claims		NO
Industrial Applicability	Claims	1 - 11	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and Explanations

The subject-matter of claims 1-11 is known from intermediate document (1) WO-A-03/041807 originating from the same inventors.

This document (1) was published on 22.05.03 before the date of filing of the present application on 11.11.03, and filed on 12.11.02 before the priority date of the present application on 14.11.02, by inventors who are the same as those mentioned in connection with the present application. This means that the priority application of 14.11.02 is not the first application disclosing for the first time any or all of the subject-matter of the present application, but that at least some of its subject-matter was disclosed in the above earlier application of 12.11.02 originating from the same inventjoas. Consequently the priority must be regarded as invalid (within the meaning of Rule 64.1(b)(ii) of the PCT), as far as said subject-matter was already disclosed in said document (1), in agreement with the provisions of the Paris Convention regulating the rights to priority.

As a result any subject-matter which was already disclosed in document (1) is regarded as being disclosed on 22.05.03 before effective date of filing of the present invention, and may be applied to assess novelty and inventive step.

It is clear from the disclosure in document (1) that the whole subject-matter of claim 1 is known from said document. The same objections apply to the additional features of claims 2 to 7.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT.

The arguments of the Applicant regarding alleged differences in respect of the kind of clothing which is <u>claimed</u> are not convincing. Clearly <u>overalls</u> are disclosed in document (1) and the Applicant cannot argue that some overalls would be different from others, since overalls in the broadest definition are claimed in present claim 1.

The same objections apply to the various uses of claims 8 to 11 which are also disclosed in the same terms in document (1).